

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/702,557	SEO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	CHRISTOPHER FINDLEY	2621

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) CHRISTOPHER FINDLEY. (3) _____
 (2) Jared Scholz (Reg. No. 64,088). (4) _____

Date of Interview: 01 April 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1-30 and 32.

Identification of prior art discussed: Kaneshige et al. (US 6360055 B1) and Inoshita et al. (US 7024102 B1).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Proposed claim amendments in view of the Kaneshige reference and the Examiner's claim interpretation were discussed.
 (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



/Christopher Findley/